

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application based on the amendments made to the claims and the following remarks are respectfully requested. Claims 1-24 are now pending in this application.

In Section 4 of the Office Action, dated October 8, 2003, the Examiner rejected claims 6, 14, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. By this amendment, claims 6, 14, and 22 have been amended to address the Examiner's rejections. The amended claims make it clear that a payment for rewarding the use of a processor is computed based on the CPU time used for the processor to perform the at least one algorithm portion on the at least one data portion sent to the processor.

In Section 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-24 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Kurowski et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0019844). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Kurowski et al. disclose a distributed computing system, in which there are at least three logical servers, namely a task server, a file server, and an application server, that are necessary to manage the task flow in the distributed computing system (See abstract, Fig. 2, Fig. 3). Particularly, each of the logical servers may comprise a plurality of physical computers that are distributed at geographically separate locations (see paragraph 42). That is, there may be a plurality of task servers, a plurality of file servers, and a plurality of application servers. This forms a distributed infrastructure without a center (see paragraph 42).

In Kurowski's system, there is a plurality of clients whose processors may be used to perform computations. The essential teaching in Kurowski et al. is a client

software downloaded on each of the clients to control communications with three different types of servers in order to achieve distributed computing (see paragraph 40). Notice here, a client machine is **required** to, via the disclosed client software, **actively initiate interactions with three types of servers** (see abstract, Fig. 3, and paragraph 61) before a client machine can start to perform computing. Particularly, when a task server assigns a task to a client, it sends only the information that “the client needs to determine how it can run the next task: unique computational module ID; computational module version number; URL to get the computational module, ...” (see paragraph 154). That is, after contacting the task server, the client **must additionally**, on its own initiative and controlled by the client software running on the client machine, **communicate with a separate file server** to download the application module using the information provided by the task server and, furthermore, communicate with **a third separate application server** to download input data for the application module (see abstract, paragraph 61, paragraphs 154 and 155) before the client can start to perform the assigned task.

The Applicant claims a parallel data processing system, in which an originating module, sends a task, comprising at least one of a plurality of algorithm portions and at least one of a plurality of data portions, to data processing device (client) for computation when the task is assigned to the processor of the data processing device, as recited in the amended claims 1 and 17. That is, when a task is assigned to a processing device, it is also sent to the processor of the processing device. The processing device **does not need to separately communicate with other servers** to obtain the task instructions and the data needed in order to start to perform the assigned task.

In a different embodiment, algorithm portion(s) that defines a task may be sent to a processing device at a time different from the time the data needed to perform the task is sent to the processing device (see amended claim 9). Similarly, both the algorithm portion(s) and the data needed to run the algorithm portion(s) are sent by an originating module to the processing device. That is, the processing device (or client) **does not need to separately communicate with other servers** to obtain the task instructions and the data needed in order to start to perform the assigned task.

Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1, 9, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) be withdrawn.

Claims 2-8 depend from claim 1. Consequently, Claims 2-8 are patentable at least for the reasons stated above with respect to claim 1 and for the addition features recited therein. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 2-8 under §102(e) be withdrawn.

Claims 10-16 depend from claim 9. Consequently, claims 10-16 are patentable at least for the reasons stated above with respect to claim 9 and for the addition features recited therein. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 10-16 under §102(e) be withdrawn.

Claims 18-24 depend from claim 17. Consequently, claims 18-24 are patentable at least for the reasons stated above with respect to claim 17 and for the addition features recited therein. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 18-24 under §102(e) be withdrawn.

If any point remains in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, he is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
Pillsbury Winthrop, LLP

By: 

Dale S. Lazar
Reg. No.: 28872
Tel. No.: (703) 905-2126
Fax No.: (703) 905-2500

DSL\QCH:ml
P.O. Box 10500
McLean, VA 22102
(703) 905-2000